arXiv:1605.06889v1 [math.CA] 23 May 2016

Generalised differences and multiplier operators in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$

Rodney Nillsen
School of Mathematics and Applied Statistics
University of Wollongong, Northfields Avenue, Wollongong
New South Wales, 2522, AUSTRALIA
email address: nillsen@uow.edu.au

Abstract

Let $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ be given and let $s \in \mathbb{N}$ also be given. Let δ_x denote the Dirac measure at $x \in \mathbb{R}$, and let $*$ denote convolution. If $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$, and if there are $u \in \mathbb{R}$ and $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ such that

$$f = \left[\left([e^{iu(\frac{\alpha-\beta}{2})} + e^{-iu(\frac{\alpha-\beta}{2})}\right)\delta_0 - \left(\, e^{iu(\frac{\alpha+\beta}{2})}\,\delta_u + e^{-iu(\frac{\alpha+\beta}{2})}\,\delta_{-u}\right)\right]^s * g,$$

then f is called a *generalised* (α, β)*-difference of order* $2s$, or simply a *generalised difference*. We denote by $\mathcal{D}_{\alpha,\beta,s}(\mathbb{R})$ the vector space of all functions f in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ such that f is a finite sum of generalised (α, β)-differences of order $2s$. It is shown that every function in $\mathcal{D}_{\alpha,\beta,s}(\mathbb{R})$ is a sum of $4s + 1$ generalised (α, β)-differences of order $2s$. If we let $\widehat{f}$ denote the Fourier transform of a function $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$, then $\mathcal{D}_{\alpha,\beta,s}(\mathbb{R})$ is a weighted L^2-space under the Fourier transform, and its inner product $\langle\ ,\ \rangle_{\alpha,\beta,s}$ is given by

$$\langle f, g\rangle_{\alpha,\beta,s} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(1 + \frac{1}{(x-\alpha)^{2s}(x-\beta)^{2s}}\right) \widehat{f}(x)\overline{\widehat{g}(x)}dx.$$

Letting D denote differentiation and letting I denote the identity operator, the operator $(D^2 - i(\alpha + \beta)D - \alpha\beta I)^s$ is bounded and invertible, mapping the Sobolev subspace of order $2s$ of $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ onto the Hilbert space $\mathcal{D}_{\alpha,\beta,s}(\mathbb{R})$.

1 Introduction

Let $\mathbb{R}$ denote the set of real numbers, let $\mathbb{T}$ denote the set of complex numbers of modulus 1, and let G denote either $\mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{T}$. Note that in some contexts $\mathbb{T}$ may be

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 42A38, 42A45 Secondary 47B39
Key words and phrases. Fourier transforms, multiplier operators, generalised differences, weighted L^2-spaces

identified with the interval $[0, 2\pi)$ under the mapping $t \longmapsto e^{it}$ (some comments on this are in [9, page 1034]). Then G is a group and its identity element we denote by e, so that $e = 0$ when $G = \mathbb{R}$ and $e = 1$ when $G = \mathbb{T}$. Let $\mathbb{N}$ denote the set of natural numbers, $\mathbb{Z}$ the set of integers, and let $s \in \mathbb{N}$. The Fourier transform of $f \in L^2(G)$ is denoted by $\widehat{f}$, and is given by $\widehat{f}(n) = (2\pi)^{-1} \int_0^{2\pi} f(e^{it}) e^{-int}$ for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ (in the case of $\mathbb{T}$), and by the extension to all of $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ of the transform given by $\widehat{f}(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-ixu} f(u)\, du$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$ (in the case of $\mathbb{R}$). Let $M(G)$ denote the family of bounded Borel measures on G. If $x \in G$ let δ_x denote the Dirac measure at x, and let $*$ denote convolution in $M(G)$.

We call a function $f \in L^2(G)$ a *difference of order* s if there is a function $g \in L^2(G)$ and $u \in G$ such that $f = (\delta_e - \delta_u)^s * g$. The functions in $L^2(G)$ that are a sum of a finite number of differences of order s we denote by $\mathcal{D}_s(G)$. Note that $\mathcal{D}_s(G)$ is a vector subspace of $L^2(G)$. Now in the case of $\mathbb{T}$ it was shown by Meisters and Schmidt [3] that

$$\mathcal{D}_1(\mathbb{T}) = \Big\{ f : f \in L^2(\mathbb{T}) \text{ and } \widehat{f}(0) = 0 \Big\},$$

and that every function in $\mathcal{D}_1(\mathbb{T})$ is a sum of 3 differences of order s. It was shown in [6] that, for all $s \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathcal{D}_s(\mathbb{T}) = \mathcal{D}_1(\mathbb{T}) = \Big\{ f : f \in L^2(\mathbb{T}) \text{ and } \widehat{f}(0) = 0 \Big\}, \tag{1.1}$$

and that every function in $\mathcal{D}_s(\mathbb{T})$ is a sum of $2s + 1$ differences of order s. It was also shown in [6] that

$$\mathcal{D}_s(\mathbb{R}) = \left\{ f : f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}) \text{ and } \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{|\widehat{f}(x)|^2}{|x|^{2s}}\, dx < \infty \right\}, \tag{1.2}$$

and again, that every function in $\mathcal{D}_s(\mathbb{R})$ is a sum of $2s + 1$ differences of order s. Further results related to the work of Meisters and Schmidt in [3] may be found in [1, 2, 4, 7].

The Sobolev space of order s in $L^2(G)$ is the space of all functions $f \in L^2(G)$ such that $D^s(f) \in L^2(G)$, where D denotes differentiation in the sense of Schwartz distributions. Then, D^s is a *multiplier operator* on $W^s(\mathbb{T})$ with *multiplier* $(in)^s$, in the sense that $D^s(f)\widehat{\ }(n) = (in)^s \widehat{f}(n)$, for all $f \in W^s(\mathbb{T})$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Also, D^s is a multiplier operator on $W^s(\mathbb{R})$ with multiplier $(ix)^s$, the sense that $D^s(f)\widehat{\ }(x) = (ix)^s \widehat{f}(x)$, for all $f \in W^s(\mathbb{R})$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Note that $W^s(\mathbb{T})$ is a Hilbert space whose norm $||\cdot||_{\mathbb{T},s}$ derives from the inner product $\langle\, ,\, \rangle_{\mathbb{T},s}$ where

$$\langle f, g \rangle_{\mathbb{T},s} = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \left(1 + |n|^{2s}\right) \widehat{f}(n) \overline{\widehat{g}(n)}\, dx.$$

Note also that $W^s(\mathbb{R})$ is a Hilbert space whose norm $||\cdot||_{\mathbb{R},s}$ derives from the inner product $\langle\, ,\, \rangle_{\mathbb{R},s}$ where

$$\langle f, g \rangle_{\mathbb{R},s} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(1 + |x|^{2s}\right) \widehat{f}(x) \overline{\widehat{g}(x)}\, dx.$$

Using these observations, together with Plancherel's Theorem, it is easy to verify that

$$D^s(W^s(\mathbb{T})) = \Big\{ f : f \in L^2(\mathbb{T}) \text{ and } \widehat{f}(0) = 0 \Big\}, \text{ and that} \tag{1.3}$$

$$D^s(W^s(\mathbb{R})) = \left\{ f : f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}) \text{ and } \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{|\widehat{f}(x)|^2}{|x|^{2s}}\, dx < \infty \right\}. \tag{1.4}$$

In view of (1.3) and (1.4), (1.1) together with (1.2) can be regarded as describing the ranges of D^s upon $W^s(\mathbb{T})$ and $W^s(\mathbb{R})$ as spaces consisting of finite sums of differences of order s. Corresponding results have been obtained in [8] for operators $(D^2 - i(\alpha+\beta)D - \alpha\beta I)^s$ acting on $W^{2s}(\mathbb{T})$, where $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}$ and I denotes the identity operator. In this paper, the main aim is to derive corresponding results for the operator $(D^2 - i(\alpha+\beta) - \alpha\beta I)^s$, where $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$, for the non-compact case of $\mathbb{R}$ in place of the compact group $\mathbb{T}$. Note that, in general, the range of a multiplier operator depends upon the behaviour of Fourier transforms at or around the zeros of the multiplier of the operator, as in (1.3) and (1.4). Note also that $(D^2 - i(\alpha+\beta)D - \alpha\beta I)^s$ is a multiplier operator whose multiplier is, in the case of $\mathbb{R}$, $-(x-\alpha)(x-\beta)$ with zeros at α and β.

Given $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $s \in \mathbb{N}$, a *generalised* (α, β)*-difference of order* $2s$ is a function $f \in L^2(G)$ such that for some $g \in L^2(G)$ and $u \in G$ we have

$$f = \left[\left([e^{iu\left(\frac{\alpha-\beta}{2}\right)} + e^{-iu\left(\frac{\alpha-\beta}{2}\right)} \right) \delta_0 - \left(e^{iu\left(\frac{\alpha+\beta}{2}\right)} \delta_u + e^{-iu\left(\frac{\alpha+\beta}{2}\right)} \delta_{-u} \right) \right]^s * g. \tag{1.5}$$

It may be called also an (α, β)*-difference of order* $2s$, or simply a *generalised difference*. In the case when $G = \mathbb{T}$, we restrict α and β to be in $\mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbb{T}$ is identified with $[0, 2\pi)$. The vector space of functions in $L^2(G)$ that can be expressed as some finite sum of (α, β)-differences of order $2s$ is denoted by $\mathcal{D}_{\alpha,\beta,s}(G)$. Thus, $f \in \mathcal{D}_{\alpha,\beta,s}(\mathbb{R})$ if and only if there are $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_m \in \mathbb{R}$ and $f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_m \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ such that

$$f = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \left[\left(e^{iu_j\left(\frac{\alpha-\beta}{2}\right)} + e^{-iu_j\left(\frac{\alpha-\beta}{2}\right)} \right) \delta_0 - \left(e^{iu_j\left(\frac{\alpha+\beta}{2}\right)} \delta_{u_j} + e^{-iu_j\left(\frac{\alpha+\beta}{2}\right)} \delta_{-u_j} \right) \right]^s * f_j.$$

We prove that if $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$, $f \in \mathcal{D}_{\alpha,\beta,s}(\mathbb{R})$ if and only if $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (x-\alpha)^{-2s}(x-\beta)^{-2s} |\widehat{f}(x)|^2 < \infty$, in which case f is a sum of $4s+1$ (α, β)-differences of order $2s$. It follows that $\mathcal{D}_{\alpha,\beta,s}(\mathbb{R})$ is the range of $(D^2 - i(\alpha+\beta) - \alpha\beta I)^s(\mathbb{R})$ on $W^{2s}(\mathbb{R})$, and is a weighted L^2-space under the Fourier transform in which the inner product of f and g is $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \big(1 + (x-\alpha)^{-2s}(x-\beta)^{-2s}\big) \widehat{f}(x) \overline{\widehat{g}(x)}\, dx$.

Now, if $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}$, and if we take an (α, β)-difference f in $L^2(\mathbb{T})$ as in (1.5) with $G = \mathbb{T}$, then $\widehat{f}(\alpha) = \widehat{g}(\beta) = 0$. In [8] it is proved that if f in $L^2(\mathbb{T})$ and $\widehat{f}(\alpha) = \widehat{g}(\beta) = 0$, then f is a sum of $4s+1$ (α, β)-differences of order s. Thus, the results obtained here extend the results obtained in [8], for the compact case of the circle group $\mathbb{T}$, to the non-compact case of $\mathbb{R}$. The techniques used here develop the approach in [8], so as to deal with the additional complexities in going from $\mathbb{T}$ to $\mathbb{R}$.

2 Further notations and background

First we need some notions relating to partitions of an interval.

Definitions. If J is an interval, $\lambda(J)$ denotes its length. A *closed-interval partition* is a sequence $R_0, R_1, \ldots, R_{r-1}$ of closed intervals of positive length such that $r = 1$ or, when $r \geq 2$, the right hand endpoint of R_j is the left hand endpoint of R_{j+1} for all $j = 0, 1, \ldots, r-2$. We may refer to such a closed-interval partition as $\{R_0, R_1, \ldots, R_{r-1}\}$, where we understand that the intervals R_j may be rearranged so as to get a sequence forming a closed-interval partition. In this case if we put $J = \cup_{j=0}^{r-1} R_j$ then $\{R_0, R_1, \ldots, R_{r-1}\}$ may be called a *closed-interval partition of J.* If $\{R_0, R_1, \ldots, R_{r-1}\}$ is a closed-interval partition and $\{S_0, S_1, \ldots, S_{s-1}\}$ is also a closed-interval partition, then $\{R_j \cap S_k : 0 \leq j \leq r-1, 0 \leq k \leq s-1 \text{ and } \lambda(R_j \cap S_k) > 0\}$ is a closed-interval partition, and we call it the *refinement* of the closed-interval partitions $\{R_0, R_1, \ldots, R_{r-1}\}$ and $\{S_0, S_1, \ldots, S_{s-1}\}$. Finally, if A is a set, A^c will denote its complement.

Lemma 2.1 *Let J be a closed interval with $\lambda(J) > 0$. Let $R_0, R_1, \ldots, R_{r-1}$ be r intervals in a closed-interval partition of a closed interval J. Let $S_0, S_1, \ldots, S_{s-1}$ be s intervals in a closed-interval partition of a closed interval K, and assume that $\lambda(R_j \cap S_k) \neq \emptyset$ for at least one pair j, k. Then the refinement of $R_0, R_1, \ldots, R_{r-1}$ and $S_0, S_1, \ldots, S_{s-1}$ is a closed-interval partition of $J \cap K$ and it has at most $r+s-1$ elements.*

Proof. It is easily checked that the refinement of $R_0, R_1, \ldots, R_{r-1}$ and $S_0, S_1, \ldots, S_{s-1}$ is a closed-interval partition of $J \cap K$. Now, for any r, s and closed-interval partitions $\mathcal{P} = \{R_0, R_1, \ldots, R_{r-1}\}$ and $\mathcal{Q} = \{S_0, S_1, \ldots, S_{s-1}\}$ let's put

$$\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}) = \{(j,k) : 0 \leq j \leq r-1, 0 \leq k \leq s-1 \text{ and } \lambda(R_j \cap S_k) > 0\}, \text{ and}$$
$$\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}) = \{k : 0 \leq k \leq s-1 \text{ and } \lambda(R_r \cap S_k) > 0\}.$$

Let $\overline{\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})}$ denote the number of elements in $\overline{\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})}$ respectively. The statement in the lemma is thus equivalent to saying that $\overline{\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})} \leq r+s-1$. If $r = 1$, we have $J = R_0$ and we see that $\overline{\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})} \leq s = 1+s-1$, so in this case the result holds for any closed-interval partition $S_0, S_1, \ldots, S_{s-1}$. We proceed by induction on r, by assuming that, for some given $r \geq 2$, for every closed-interval partition $\mathcal{P} = \{R_0, R_1, \ldots, R_{r-1}\}$ and for any closed-interval partition $\mathcal{Q}$ having s elements for arbitrary $s \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\overline{\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})} \leq r + s - 1$.

Now consider closed-interval partitions $\mathcal{P}' = \{R_0, R_1, \ldots, R_r\}$ and $\mathcal{Q}' = \{S_0, S_1, \ldots, S_{s-1}\}$. We may assume that $\overline{\mathcal{A}(\{R_0, R_1, \ldots, R_{r-1}\}, \mathcal{Q}')} \geq 1$, for otherwise we have $\overline{\mathcal{A}(\{R_0, R_1, \ldots, R_{r-1}\}, \mathcal{Q}')} = 0$, and then

$$\overline{\mathcal{A}(\{R_0, R_1, \ldots, R_r\}, \mathcal{Q}')} = \overline{\mathcal{A}(\{R_r\}, \mathcal{Q})} \leq s \leq (r+1) + s - 1,$$

as we have seen the lemma is true when one of the partitions has a single element. That is, in this case, the truth of the lemma for r implies the truth of the lemma for $r + 1$.

Now, when $\overline{(\mathcal{A}(\{R_0, R_1, \ldots, R_{r-1}\}, \mathcal{Q}')} \geq 1$, let $s_1 \in \{1, 2, \ldots, s-1\}$ be the maximum of all $k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, s-1\}$ such that $\lambda(A_j \cap B_k) > 0$ for some $j \in \{0, 1, 2 \ldots, r-1\}$. By the inductive assumption, $\overline{\mathcal{A}(\{R_0, R_1, \ldots, R_{r-1}\}, \mathcal{Q}')} \leq r+s_1-1$. Also, as we go from r to $r+1$, the single interval R_r is adjoined to $R_0, R_1, \ldots, R_{r-1}$ on the right. So, we see that $\overline{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}', \mathcal{Q}')} \leq s - (s_1 - 1)$. As well, it is clear that

$$\overline{\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}', \mathcal{Q}')} \leq \overline{\mathcal{A}(\{R_0, R_1, \ldots, R_{r-1}\}, \mathcal{Q}')} + \overline{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}', \mathcal{Q}')}.$$

Using the inductive assumption it follows that

$$\overline{\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}', \mathcal{Q}')} \leq r + s_1 - 1 + s - (s_1 - 1) = (r+1) + s - 1,$$

and we see that assuming the inductive assumption holds for r implies that it holds for $r+1$. Invoking induction completes the proof. □

Lemma 2.2 *Let $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{R}$ with $c < d$, $a \leq d$ and $b \geq c$. Put*
(i) $a' = a$ if $a \in [c, d]$, and $a' = c$ if $a < c$;
(ii) $b' = b$ if $b \in [c, d]$, and $b' = d$ if $d < b$.
Then,

$$|(u-a)(u-b)| \geq |(u-a')(u-b')|, \text{ for all } u \in [c, d].$$

Proof. If $a' = a$ or $b' = b$, the result is easily checked. The only other case is when $a' = c$ and $b' = d$. In this case we have

$$(u-a)(b-u) - (u-c)(d-u) = (a+b-c-d)u - ab + cd,$$

and this expression is linear in u and non-negative for $u = c$ and $u = d$. Consequently, $(u-a)(b-u) \geq (u-c)(d-u)$ for all $u \in [c, d]$, and the proof is complete. □

Lemma 2.3 *Let $s, m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $m \geq 4s+1$, and let $V_1, V_2, \ldots, V_m$ be closed and bounded subintervals of $\mathbb{R}$. Let $c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_m, d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_m \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $c_j, d_j \in V_j$ for all $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$. Then, there is a number $M > 0$, depending upon s and m only and independent of the V_j, c_j and d_j, such that*

$$\int_{\prod_{t=1}^m V_t} \frac{du_1 du_2 \ldots du_m}{\sum_{t=1}^m (u_t - c_t)^{2s} (u_t - d_t)^{2s}} \leq M \left(\max \left\{ \mu(V_1), \mu(V_2), \ldots, \mu(V_m) \right\} \right)^{m-4s}.$$

Proof. See [8, Lemma 4.2]. □

Theorem 2.4 *Let $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ and let $\mu_1, \mu_2, \ldots, \mu_r \in M(\mathbb{R})$. Then the following conditions (i) and (ii) are equivalent.*
(i) There are $f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_r \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ such that $f = \sum_{j=1}^r \mu_j * f_j$.
(ii)

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{|\widehat{f}(x)|^2}{\sum_{j=1}^r |\widehat{\mu}_j(x)|^2} \, dx < \infty.$$

Proof. This is essentially proved in [3, pages 411-412], but see also [6, pages 77-88] and [7, page 23]. □

3 Main results

The main aim in this paper is to prove the following result.

Theorem 3.1 *Let $s \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $\mathcal{D}_{\alpha,\beta,s}(\mathbb{R})$ be the vector space of functions $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ that can be expressed as some finite sum of (α,β)-differences of order $2s$. Then the following conditions (i) - (iii) are equivalent for a function $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$.*

(i) $\displaystyle\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{|\widehat{f}(x)|^2}{(x-\alpha)^{2s}(x-\beta)^{2s}}dx < \infty.$

(ii) $f \in \mathcal{D}_{\alpha,\beta,s}(\mathbb{R})$.

(iii) There are $u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_{4s+1} \in \mathbb{R}$ and $f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_{4s+1} \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ such that

$$f = \sum_{j=1}^{4s+1} \left[\left(e^{iu_j(\frac{\alpha-\beta}{2})} + e^{-iu_j(\frac{\alpha-\beta}{2})} \right) \delta_0 - \left(e^{iu_j(\frac{\alpha+\beta}{2})} \delta_{u_j} + e^{-iu_j(\frac{\alpha+\beta}{2})} \delta_{-u_j} \right) \right]^s * f_j. \tag{3.1}$$

When the preceding conditions hold for a given function $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$, for almost all $(u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_{4s+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{4s+1}$, there are $f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_{4s+1} \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ such that (3.1) holds. Also, $\mathcal{D}_{\alpha,\beta,s}(\mathbb{R})$ is a Hilbert space with the inner product $\langle\, , \rangle_{\alpha,\beta,s}$ given by

$$\langle f, g \rangle_{\alpha,\beta,s} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(1 + \frac{1}{(x-\alpha)^{2s}(x-\beta)^{2s}} \right) \widehat{f}(x)\overline{\widehat{g}(x)}dx, \text{ for } f, g \in \mathcal{D}_{\alpha,\beta,s}(\mathbb{R}).$$

The operator $(D^2 - (\alpha+\beta)D - \alpha\beta I)^s$ is a linear, bounded and invertible operator that maps $W^{2s}(\mathbb{R})$ onto $\mathcal{D}_{\alpha,\beta,s}(\mathbb{R})$.

Proof. If (iii) holds it is clear that (ii) also holds.

Let (ii) hold. If $u \in \mathbb{R}$, define $\lambda_u \in M(\mathbb{R})$ by

$$\lambda_u = \frac{1}{2}\left[e^{iu(\frac{\alpha-\beta}{2})} + e^{-iu(\frac{\alpha-\beta}{2})} \right] \delta_0 - \frac{1}{2}\left[\, e^{iu(\frac{\alpha+\beta}{2})} \, \delta_u + e^{-iu(\frac{\alpha+\beta}{2})} \, \delta_{-u} \right]. \tag{3.2}$$

The Fourier transform $\widehat{\lambda}_u$ of λ_u is given for $x \in \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\widehat{\lambda}_u(x) = \sin\left(u(x-\alpha)\right) \sin\left(u(x-\beta)\right). \tag{3.3}$$

So, if $u \in \mathbb{R}$ and $f, g \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ are such that $f = \lambda_u^s * g$, we have

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{|\widehat{f}(x)|^2}{(x-\alpha)^{2s}(x-\beta)^{2s}}dx = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\sin^{2s}\left(u(x-\alpha)\right) \sin^{2s}\left(u(x-\beta)\right)}{(x-\alpha)^{2s}(x-\beta)^{2s}} |\widehat{g}(x)|^2 dx < \infty.$$

Using the definition of λ_u in (3.2), we deduce that (ii) implies (i).

Now, we assume that (i) holds, and we will prove that (iii) holds. Let $c > 0$ be given and let $x \in \{\mathbb{R}\}$ also be given but with $x \notin \{\alpha, \beta\}$. Put, for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$a_k = \frac{k\pi}{|x-\alpha|}, b_k = \frac{k\pi}{|x-\beta|}, a'_k = \frac{(k-1/2)\pi}{|x-\alpha|} \text{ and } b'_k = \frac{(k-1/2)\pi}{|x-\beta|}. \tag{3.4}$$

Then put, again for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$A_k = [a'_k, a'_{k+1}] \text{ and } B_k = [b'_k, b'_{k+1}]. \tag{3.5}$$

Note that a_k is the mid-point of A_k and b_k is the mid-point of B_k. The points a_k are the zeros of $u \longmapsto \sin(u(x-\alpha))$, while the b_k are the zeros of $u \longmapsto \sin(u(x-\beta))$. It is immediate from the definitions that, for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\lambda(A_k) = \frac{\pi}{|x-\alpha|} \text{ and } \lambda(B_k) = \frac{\pi}{|x-\beta|}. \tag{3.6}$$

We will use the notation that $d_{\mathbb{Z}}(x)$ denotes the distance from $x \in \mathbb{R}$ to the nearest integer. Note that $d_{\mathbb{Z}}(x) = |x|$ if and only if $-1/2 \leq x \leq 1/2$. Note also that $|\sin(\pi x)| \geq 2d_{\mathbb{Z}}(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ (for example see [7, page 89] or [10, page 233]).

Now

$$u \in A_j \Longrightarrow \frac{(j-1/2)\pi}{|x-\alpha|} \leq u \leq \frac{(j+1/2)\pi}{|x-\alpha|} \Longrightarrow -1/2 \leq |x-\alpha| \left| \frac{u}{\pi} - \frac{j}{|x-\alpha|} \right| \leq 1/2.$$

So, for $u \in A_j$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\sin(u(x-\alpha))| &= \left| \sin\left(\pi |x-\alpha| \left| \frac{u}{\pi} - \frac{j}{|x-\alpha|} \right| \right) \right| \\ &\geq 2d_{\mathbb{Z}}\left(|x-\alpha| \left| \frac{u}{\pi} - \frac{j}{|x-\alpha|} \right| \right) \\ &= 2|x-\alpha| \left| \frac{u}{\pi} - \frac{j}{|x-\alpha|} \right| \\ &= \frac{2}{\pi} |x-\alpha| \left| u - \frac{j\pi}{|x-\alpha} \right|. \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

Similarly, for $u \in B_k$,

$$|\sin(u(x-\beta))| \geq \frac{2}{\pi} |x-\beta| \left| u - \frac{k\pi}{|x-\beta|} \right|. \tag{3.8}$$

So, for $u \in A_j \cap B_k$ we have

$$|\sin(u(x-\alpha))\sin(u(x-\beta))| \geq \frac{4}{\pi^2} |(x-\alpha)(x-\beta)| \left| u - \frac{j\pi}{|x-\alpha} \right| \cdot \left| u - \frac{k\pi}{|x-\beta} \right|.$$

That is, for $u \in A_j \cap B_k$ we have

$$|\sin(u(x-\alpha))\sin(u(x-\beta))| \geq \frac{4}{\pi^2} |(x-\alpha)(x-\beta)| \cdot |u-a_j| \cdot |u-b_k|, \tag{3.9}$$

where a_j and b_k are the points as given in (3.4), with a_j the midpoint of A_j and b_k the midpoint of B_k.

Now let the intervals A_j such that $\lambda(A_j \cap [-c,c]\,) > 0$ be $A_{m_1}, \ldots, A_{m_1+r-1}$, and let the intervals B_k such that $\lambda(B_k \cap [-c,c]\,) > 0$ be $B_{m_2}, \ldots, B_{m_2+s-1}$. Put

$$\begin{aligned} A'_j &= A_{m_1+j}, \text{ for } j = 0, 1, \ldots, r-1, \text{ and put} \\ B'_k &= B_{m_2+k}, \text{ for } k = 0, 1, \ldots, s-1. \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

Then, putting

$$\mathcal{P}_1 = \{A'_0, A'_1, \ldots, A'_{r-1}\} \text{ and } \mathcal{P}_2 = \{B'_0, B'_1, \ldots, B'_{s-1}\}, \tag{3.11}$$

we see that $\mathcal{P}_1$ and $\mathcal{P}_2$ are closed-interval partitions. If we put

$$\mathcal{A} = \{(j,k) : 0 \le j \le r-1, 0 \le k \le s-1, \text{ and } \lambda(A'_j \cap B'_k) > 0\},$$

and if we let $\mathcal{P}$ be the refinement of $\mathcal{P}_1$ and $\mathcal{P}_2$, we have

$$\mathcal{P} = \{A'_j \cap B'_k : (j,k) \in \mathcal{A}\} \text{ and } [-c,c] \subseteq \bigcup_{(j,k)\in\mathcal{A}} A'_j \cap B'_k. \tag{3.12}$$

Now, from (3.6) we see that all lengths of the r intervals in the closed-interval partition $\mathcal{P}_1$ equal $\pi/|x-\alpha|$, so that $(r-2)\pi/|x-\alpha| < 2c$. Hence,

$$1 \le r < \frac{2c|x-\alpha|}{\pi} + 2 = \frac{2c}{\pi}\left(1 + \frac{\pi}{c|x-\alpha|}\right)|x-\alpha|. \tag{3.13}$$

Let $0 < \delta < 1/2$. Then, if $|x-\alpha| > \pi\delta/c$, we have from (3.13) that

$$1 \le r < \frac{2c}{\pi}\left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta}\right)|x-\alpha|. \tag{3.14}$$

On the other hand, if $|x-\alpha| \le \pi\delta/c$, as $0 < \delta < 1/2$ we have $2c < \pi/|x-\alpha|$, and it follows from (3.6) that $[-c,c] \subseteq A_0$, so that $m_0 = 0$ and

$$r = 1. \tag{3.15}$$

Again let $0 < \delta < 1/2$. Then, as in the preceding argument, but with β replacing α, if $|x-\beta| > \pi\delta/c$ we have

$$1 \le s < \frac{2c}{\pi}\left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta}\right)|x-\beta|, \tag{3.16}$$

while if $|x-\beta| \le \pi\delta/c$, we have

$$s = 1. \tag{3.17}$$

Now, again let $0 < \delta < 1/2$. Assume that either $|x-\alpha| > \pi\delta/c$ or $|x-\beta| > \pi\delta/c$, with both perhaps holding. In the case that $|x-\alpha| > \pi\delta/c$ and $|x-\beta| \le \pi\delta/c$, we

have from (3.14) and (3.17) that

$$\begin{aligned} r+s-1 \leq 2\max\{r,s\} &< 2\max\left\{\frac{2c}{\pi}\left(1+\frac{1}{\delta}\right)|x-\alpha|, 1\right\} \\ &\leq 2\max\left\{\frac{2c}{\pi}\left(1+\frac{1}{\delta}\right)|x-\alpha|, \frac{2c}{\pi}\left(1+\frac{1}{\delta}\right)|x-\beta|\right\} \\ &= \frac{4c}{\pi}\left(1+\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\max\{|x-\alpha|, |x-\beta|)\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

The argument that produced (3.18) is symmetric in α and β, and we see from (3.14), (3.15), (3.16) and (3.17) that in all cases when either $|x-\alpha| > \pi\delta/c$ or $|x-\beta| > \pi\delta/c$ we have

$$r+s-1 \leq 2\max\{r,s\} \leq \frac{4c}{\pi}\left(1+\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\max\Big\{|x-\alpha|, |x-\beta|\Big\}. \tag{3.19}$$

Also, observe that if $0 < \delta < 1/2$, $|x-\alpha| \leq \pi\delta/c$ and $|x-\beta| \leq \pi\delta/c$, we have from (3.15) and (3.17) that

$$r = s = 1. \tag{3.20}$$

Note that in the above, a_k, b_k, A_k, B_k and so on, depend upon x. In particular, r and s depend upon x.

We now take $m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $m \geq 4s+1$, and we estimate the integral

$$\int_{[-c,c]^m} \frac{du_1 du_2 \dots du_m}{\displaystyle\sum_{j=1}^{m} \sin^{2s} u_j\,(x-\alpha)\,\sin^{2s} u_j\,(x-\beta)},$$

allowing for the different values x may be, but recall that $x \notin \{\alpha, \beta\}$. We let $\mathcal{P}_1$, $\mathcal{P}_2$ be the closed-interval partition as given in (3.11) and let $\mathcal{P}$ be their refinement as given in (3.12). We have, using the definitions and (3.4), (3.9), (3.10) and (3.12),

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{[-c,c]^m} \frac{du_1 du_2 \dots du_m}{\displaystyle\sum_{j=1}^{m} \sin^{2s} u_j\,(x-\alpha)\,\sin^{2s} u_j\,(x-\beta)} \\ &\leq \sum_{(j_1,k_1),(j_2,k_2),\dots,(j_m,k_m)\in\mathcal{A}} \int_{\prod_{t=1}^m A'_{j_t}\cap B'_{k_t}} \frac{du_1 du_2 \dots du_m}{\displaystyle\sum_{j=1}^{m} \sin^{2s} u_j\,(x-\alpha)\,\sin^{2s} u_j\,(x-\beta)} \\ &\leq \frac{\pi^{4s}}{2^{4s}(x-\alpha)^{2s}(x-\beta)^{2s}} \sum_{(j_1,k_1),\dots,(j_m,k_m)\in\mathcal{A}} \int_{\prod_{t=1}^m A'_{j_t}\cap B'_{k_t}} \frac{du_1 du_2 \dots du_m}{(u_j - a_{m_1+j_t})^{2s}(u_j - b_{m_2+k_t})^{2s}}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

Now in (3.21), the points $a_{m_1+j_t}, b_{m_2+k_t}$ do not necessarily belong to $A'_{j_t} \cap B'_{k_t}$. However, suppose that $a_{m_1+j_t}, b_{m_2+k_t} \notin A'_{j_t} \cap B'_{k_t}$ with $a_{m_1+j_t} \leq b_{m_2+k_t}$ and with

both $a_{m_1+j_t}$ and $b_{m_2+k_t}$ lying to the left of $A'_{j_t} \cap B'_{k_t}$. Let y be the left endpoint of $A'_{j_t} \cap B'_{k_t}$. Then, $a_{m_1+j_t} \in A_{m_1+j_t}$ so we see that $[a_{m_1+j_t}, y] \subseteq A_{m_1+j_t}$. Similarly, $[b_{m_2+k_t}, y] \subseteq B_{m_2+k_t}$. We deduce that

$$[b_{m_2+k_t}, y] \subseteq A_{m_1+j_t} \cap B_{m_2+k_t} = A'_{j_t} \cap B'_{k_t},$$

so that $b_{m_2+k_t} \in A'_{j_t} \cap B'_{k_t}$, and this contradicts the fact that $b_{m_2+k_t} \notin A'_{j_t} \cap B'_{k_t}$. This argument, repeated for other cases, means we can say that if $a_{m_1+j_t}, b_{m_2+k_t} \notin A'_{j_t} \cap B'_{k_t}$, then $a_{m_1+j_t}$ is on the left of $A'_{j_t} \cap B'_{k_t}$ and $b_{m_2+k_t}$ is on the right of $A'_{j_t} \cap B'_{k_t}$, or *vice versa*.

Now, let $t \in \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$ and $(j_t, k_t) \in \mathcal{A}$ be given. In Lemma 2.2, let's take $[c, d]$ to be $A'_{j_t} \cap B'_{k_t}$, a to be $\min\{a_{m_1+j_t}, b_{m_2+k_t}\}$, and b to be $\max\{a_{m_1+j_t}, b_{m_2+k_t}\}$. The observation at the end of the preceding paragraph implies that we must have $a \leq d$ and $b \geq c$. Also, note that either $a = a_{m_1+j_t}$ and $b = b_{m_2+k_t}$ or *vice versa*. Then, from Lemma 2.2 we have

$$|(u - a_{m_1+j_t})(u - b_{m_2+k_t})| \geq |(u - a'_{m_1+j_t})(u - b'_{m_2+k_t})|, \text{ for all } u \in A'_{j_t} \cap B'_{k_t}. \quad (3.22)$$

Now let $0 < \delta < 1/2$ and assume that we have either $|x - \alpha| > \pi\delta/c$ or $|x - \beta| > \pi\delta/c$. Then from Lemma 2.1, the right hand side of (3.19) gives an upper bound for the number of elements in $\mathcal{P}$. Using (3.19), and using (3.9), (3.12), (3.20), (3.21), (3.22), Lemma 2.3 and the assumption that $m \geq 4s + 1$, we have in this case that

$$\int_{[-c,c]^m} \frac{du_1 du_2 \ldots du_m}{\sum_{j=1}^{m} \sin^{2s} u_j \, (x - \alpha) \, \sin^{2s} u_j \, (x - \beta)}$$

$$\leq \frac{\pi^{4s}}{2^{4s}(x-\alpha)^{2s}(x-\beta)^{2s}} \sum_{(j_1,k_1),\ldots,(j_m,k_m) \in \mathcal{A}} \int_{\prod_{t=1}^{m} A'_{j_t} \cap B'_{k_t}} \frac{du_1 du_2 \ldots du_m}{|u_j - a'_{m_1+j_t}|^{2s} |u_j - b'_{m_2+k_t}|^{2s}}$$

$$\leq \frac{\pi^{4s} M}{2^{4s}(x-\alpha)^{2s}(x-\beta)^{2s}} \sum_{(j_1,k_1),\ldots,(j_m,k_m) \in \mathcal{A}} \left(\max \left\{ \lambda(A'_{j_1} \cap B'_{k_1}), \ldots, \lambda(A'_{j_m} \cap B'_{k_m}) \right\} \right)^{m-4s},$$

where M is the constant in Lemma 2.3 ,

$$\leq \frac{\pi^{4s-m} 2^{2m-4s} c^m (\delta + 1)^m M}{\delta^m (x-\alpha)^{2s}(x-\beta)^{2s}} \max \left\{ |x - \alpha|^m, |x - \beta|^m \right\} \min \left\{ \frac{\pi^{m-4s}}{|x-\alpha|^{m-4s}}, \frac{\pi^{m-4s}}{|x-\beta|^{m-4s}} \right\},$$

using (3.6),

$$\leq Q \max \left\{ \frac{(x-\alpha)^{2s}}{(x-\beta)^{2s}}, \frac{(x-\beta)^{2s}}{(x-\alpha)^{2s}} \right\}, \quad (3.23)$$

for all $x \notin \{\alpha, \beta\}$ with either $|x - \alpha| > \pi\delta/c$ or $|x - \beta| > \pi\delta/c$. Note that the constant Q in (3.23) is independent of x.

CASE I: $\alpha \neq \beta$.

In this case, choose δ so that

$$0 < \delta < \min\left\{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{c|\alpha-\beta|}{2\pi}\right\}. \tag{3.24}$$

Then, define disjoint intervals J, K by putting

$$J = \left[\alpha - \frac{\pi\delta}{c}, \alpha + \frac{\pi\delta}{c}\right] \text{ and } K = \left[\beta - \frac{\pi\delta}{c}, \beta + \frac{\pi\delta}{c}\right].$$

Clearly, there is $C_1 > 0$ such that

$$\max\left\{\frac{(x-\alpha)^{2s}}{(x-\beta)^{2s}}, \frac{(x-\beta)^{2s}}{(x-\alpha)^{2s}}\right\} \leq C_1, \text{ for all } x \in (J \cup K)^c. \tag{3.25}$$

As well, $(x-\beta)^{-2s}$ is bounded on J, so we see that there is $C_2 > 0$ such that

$$\max\left\{\frac{(x-\alpha)^{2s}}{(x-\beta)^{2s}}, \frac{(x-\beta)^{2s}}{(x-\alpha)^{2s}}\right\}(x-\alpha)^{2s} \leq C_2, \text{ for all } x \in J \cap \{\alpha\}^c. \tag{3.26}$$

And, as $(x-\alpha)^{-2s}$ is bounded on K, there is $C_3 > 0$ such that

$$\max\left\{\frac{(x-\alpha)^{2s}}{(x-\beta)^{2s}}, \frac{(x-\beta)^{2s}}{(x-\alpha)^{2s}}\right\}(x-\beta)^{2s} \leq C_3, \text{ for all } x \in K \cap \{\beta\}^c. \tag{3.27}$$

We now have from (3.23), (3.25), (3.26) and (3.27), that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\left(\int_{[-c,c]^m}\frac{du_1 du_2 \dots du_m}{\sum_{j=1}^{m}\sin^{2s}u_j\,(x-\alpha)\,\sin^{2s}u_j\,(x-\beta)}\right)|\widehat{f}(x)|^2\,dx \\
&\leq C_1 Q\int_{(J\cup K)^c}|\widehat{f}(x)|^2\,dx + C_2 Q\int_J\frac{|\widehat{f}(x)|^2}{(x-\alpha)^{2s}}dx + C_3 Q\int_K\frac{|\widehat{f}(x)|^2}{(x-\beta)^{2s}}dx \\
&< \infty,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.28}$$

as we are assuming that $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}|\widehat{f}(x)|^2(x-\alpha)^{-2s}(x-\beta)^{-2s} < \infty$.

CASE II. $\alpha = \beta$.

Let's assume that $\alpha \in (-c, c)$ and that

$$\delta < \min\left\{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{c(c-|\alpha|)}{\pi}\right\}. \tag{3.29}$$

Put $L = (\,\alpha - \pi\delta/c, \alpha + \pi\delta/c\,)$, and observe that because of (3.29), $L \subseteq (-c, c)$. If $x \in L$, we have $|x-\alpha| < \pi\delta/c$ and it follows from (3.12) and (3.15) that $r = 1$. Now

as $r = 1$ and as $A_0 \cap [-c, c] \neq \emptyset$, we see that $[-c, c] \subseteq A_0 = A_0' = B_0'$. In this case, in (3.7) we must have $k = 0$, and as $L \subseteq [-c, c] \subseteq A_0'$, we deduce from (3.7) that

$$|\sin(u(x-\alpha))| \geq \frac{2}{\pi}|u| \cdot |x-\alpha|, \text{ for all } x \in L \text{ and } u \in (-c, c). \tag{3.30}$$

Let $C > 0$ be such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m} u_j^{4s} \geq C \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m} u_j^2 \right)^{2s}, \text{ for all } (u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m. \tag{3.31}$$

We now have from (3.30) and (3.31) that if $m \geq 4s + 1$ and $x \in L$,

$$\int_{[-c,c]^m} \frac{du_1 du_2 \ldots du_m}{\sum_{j=1}^{m} \sin^{4s} u_j \, (x-\alpha)}$$

$$\leq \frac{\pi^{4s}}{2^{4s}(x-\alpha)^{4s}} \int_{[-c,c]^m} \frac{du_1 du_2 \ldots du_m}{\sum_{j=1}^{m} u_j^{4s}}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{C} \cdot \frac{\pi^{4s}}{2^{4s}(x-\alpha)^{4s}} \int_{[-c,c]^m} \frac{du_1 du_2 \ldots du_m}{\left(\sum_{j=1}^{m} u_j^2 \right)^{2s}}$$

$$\leq \frac{D}{C} \cdot \frac{\pi^{4s}}{2^{4s}(x-\alpha)^{4s}} \int_0^{c\sqrt{m}} r^{m-4s-1} \, dr,$$

for some $D > 0$, by [10, pages 394-395],

$$\leq \frac{G}{(x-\alpha)^{4s}}, \tag{3.32}$$

for some $G > 0$ that is independent of $x \in L \cap \{\alpha\}^c$.

On the other hand, if $x \notin L$ we have $|x - \alpha| \geq \pi\delta/c$, so that if we apply (3.23) with $\alpha = \beta$ we have

$$\int_{[-c,c]^m} \frac{du_1 du_2 \ldots du_m}{\sum_{j=1}^{m} \sin^{4s} u_j \, (x-\alpha)} \leq Q < \infty. \tag{3.33}$$

Assuming that $|\alpha| < c$, we now have, using (3.32) and (3.33) and the fact that $\mathbb{R} = L \cup L^c$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(\int_{[-c,c]^m} \frac{du_1 du_2 \dots du_m}{\sum_{j=1}^{m} \sin^{4s} u_j\,(x-\alpha)} \right) |\widehat{f}(x)|^2 dx \\
&\leq G \int_L \frac{|\widehat{f}(x)|^2}{(x-\alpha)^{4s}} dx \; + Q \int_{L^c} |\widehat{f}(x)|^2 dx \\
&< \infty, \qquad (3.34)
\end{aligned}$$

as $\alpha = \beta$ and we are assuming that $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\widehat{f}(x)|^2 (x-\alpha)^{-2s}(x-\beta)^{-2s}\, dx < \infty$.

We have considered the cases $\alpha \neq \beta$ and $\alpha = \beta$. The dénoument results from using Fubini's Theorem, (3.28) and (3.34). We see that provided $|\alpha| < c$ and $m \geq 4s+1$, in both cases we have

$$\int_{[-c,c]^m} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{|\widehat{f}(x)|^2 dx}{\sum_{j=1}^{m} \sin^{2s} u_j\,(x-\alpha)\, \sin^{2s} u_j(x-\beta)} \right) du_1 du_2 \dots du_m < \infty.$$

We conclude from this that for almost all $(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_m) \in [-c,c]^m$,

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{|\widehat{f}(x)|^2 dx}{\sum_{j=1}^{m} \sin^{2s}(u_j(x-\alpha))\, \sin^{2s}(u_j(x-\beta))} < \infty. \qquad (3.35)$$

By letting c tend to ∞ through a sequence of values, we deduce that, in fact, the inequality in (3.35) holds for almost all $(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$. But then, using (3.3) and Theorem 2.4, we see that provided $m \geq 4s+1$, for almost all $(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ there are $f_1, f_2, \dots, f_m \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ such that

$$f = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \left[\left(e^{ib_j(\frac{\alpha-\beta}{2})} + e^{-ib_j(\frac{\alpha-\beta}{2})} \right) \delta_0 - \left(e^{ib_j(\frac{\alpha+\beta}{2})} \delta_{b_j} + e^{-ib_j(\frac{\alpha+\beta}{2})} \delta_{-b_j} \right) \right]^s * f_j.$$

We deduce that (i) implies (ii) in Theorem 3.1 and, by taking $m = 4s+1$, we see that (i) implies (iii).

We have now proved that (i), (ii) and (iii) are equivalent. Also, the statement that (iii) is possible for almost all $(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{4s+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{4s+1}$ has been proved.

Finally, put $T = (D^2 - i(\alpha+\beta)D - \alpha\beta I)^s$. Then, if $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ we have $(T(g))\widehat{\ }(x) =$

$(-1)^s(x-\alpha)^s(x-\beta)^s\widehat{g}(x)$. Consequently, $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}(x-\alpha)^{-2s}(x-\beta)^{-2s}|(T(g))\widehat{\ }(x)|^2\,dx < \infty$. As the multiplier of T is $(-1)^s(x-\alpha)^{-2s}(x-\beta)^{-2s}$, it is easy to see that there is $K>0$ such that

$$||T(g)||^2_{\alpha,\beta,s} = \langle T(g), T(g)\rangle_{\alpha,\beta,s} \leq K\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}(1+x^{4s})|\widehat{g}(x)|^2\,dx \leq K||g||^2_{\mathbb{R},2s} < \infty,$$

and it follows that T is bounded from $W^{2s}(\mathbb{R})$ into $\mathcal{D}_{\alpha,\beta,s}(\mathbb{R})$. As the multiplier of T vanishes only at the two points α and β, T is injective on $W^{2s}(\mathbb{R})$. Finally, if $h\in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ is such that $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}(x-\alpha)^{-2s}(x-\beta)^{-2s}|\widehat{h}(x)|^2\,dx<\infty$, we may let $g\in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ be the function such that $\widehat{g}(x)=(-1)^s(x-\alpha)^{-s}(x-\beta)^{-s}\widehat{h}(x)$. It is easy to see that $g\in W^{2s}(\mathbb{R})$ and that $T(g)=h$. Consequently, T maps $W^{2s}(\mathbb{R})$ onto $\mathcal{D}_{\alpha,\beta,s}(\mathbb{R})$, and it follows that T is a bounded invertible linear operator from $W^{2s}(\mathbb{R})$ onto $\mathcal{D}_{\alpha,\beta,s}(\mathbb{R})$. This completes the proof of Theorem 3.1. □

Note that an alternative proof of Theorem 3.1 for the special case $\alpha=\beta$ may be derived from the identity (1.2), which was proved originally in [6] and [7]. In [3] Meisters and Schmidt showed that every translation invariant linear form on $L^2(\mathbb{T})$ is continuous, but in [4] it was shown that there are discontinuous translation invariant linear forms on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$, and this latter result may also be deduced from the subsequent identity (1.2).

Definition. Let $\alpha,\beta\in\mathbb{R}$ and let $s\in\mathbb{N}$. Then a linear form T on $L^2(G)$ is called (α,β,s)-*invariant* if, for all $f\in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ and $u\in L^2(\mathbb{R})$,

$$T\Big(\Big[\Big(e^{iu(\frac{\alpha-\beta}{2})}+e^{-iu(\frac{\alpha-\beta}{2})}\Big)\delta_0-\Big(e^{iu(\frac{\alpha+\beta}{2})}\delta_u+e^{-iu_j(\frac{\alpha+\beta}{2})}\delta_{-u_j}\Big)\Big]^s * f\Big)=T(f).$$

When $\alpha,\beta\in\mathbb{Z}$, we may also introduce the notion of (α,β,s)-invariant linear forms on $L^2(\mathbb{T})$. It was shown in [8] that an $(\alpha,\beta,1)$-invariant linear form on $L^2(\mathbb{T})$ is continuous and, in fact, any (α,β,s)-invariant linear form on $L^2(\mathbb{T})$ is continuous (proved using the same technique as in [8] for the case $s=1$). Together with the preceding comments, the following corollary to Theorem 3.1 shows that the situation pertaining to translation invariant linear forms on $L^2(\mathbb{T})$ and $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ is mirrored by that for (α,β,s)-invariant linear forms on $L^2(\mathbb{T})$ and $L^2(\mathbb{R})$.

Corollary 3.2 *Let $\alpha,\beta\in\mathbb{R}$ and let $s\in\mathbb{N}$. Then, there are discontinuous (α,β,s)-invariant linear forms on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$.*

Proof. We see from the definitions that if T is a linear form on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$, then T is (α,β,s)-invariant if and only if T vanishes on $\mathcal{D}_{\alpha,\beta,s}(\mathbb{R})$. However, it is consequence of Theorem 3.1 that $\mathcal{D}_{\alpha,\beta,s}(\mathbb{R})$ has infinite algebraic codimension in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$. Consequently there are discontinuous linear forms on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ that vanish on $\mathcal{D}_{\alpha,\beta,s}(\mathbb{R})$, and such forms are also (α,β,s) invariant. □

References

[1] J. Bourgain, *Translation invariant forms on $L^p(G), 1<p<\infty$*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble), 36 (1986), 97-104.

[2] B. E. Johnson, *A proof of the translation invariant form conjecture for* $L^2(G)$, Bull. Sci. Math. 107(1983), 301-310.

[3] G. Meisters and W. Schmidt, *Translation invariant linear forms on* $L^2(G)$ *for compact abelian groups* G, J. Funct. Anal. 11 (1972), 407-424.

[4] G. Meisters, *Some discontinuous translation-invariant linear forms*, J. Funct. Anal. 12 (1973), 199-210.

[5] G. Meisters, *Some problems and results on translation-invariant linear forms*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 975 (J. M. Bachar, W. G Bade, et al, eds.), 423-444, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1983.

[6] R. Nillsen, *Banach spaces of functions and distributions characterized by singular integrals involving the Fourier transform*, J. Funct. Anal. 110 (1992), 73-95.

[7] R. Nillsen, *Difference spaces and Invariant Linear Forms*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1586, Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg New York, 1994.

[8] R. Nillsen, *Generalised differences and multiplier operators in Fourier analysis,* arXiv:1503.04524 [math.CA].

[9] K. A. Ross, *A trip from classical to abstract Fourier analysis*, Notices Amer. Math. Soc. 61 (2014), 1032-1038.

[10] K. R. Stromberg, *An Introduction to Classical Real Analysis*, Wadsworth, Belmont, 1981.